1	LAW OFFICES OF RONALD	A.
2	MARRON, APLC RONALD A. MARRON (SBN 175650) ron@consumersadvocates.com SKYE RESENDES (SBN 278511) skye@consumersadvocates.com	
3		
4		
5	651 Arroyo Drive	
6	San Diego, California 92103 Telephone: (619) 696-9006	
7	Facsimile: (619) 564-6665	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	KIM ALLEN and LAINIE	Case No.: 3:12-cv-376-BAS(JLB) CLASS ACTION
12	RIDEOUT, on behalf of themselves, all others similarly situated, and the	
13	general public,	DECLARATION OF RONALD A. MARRON IN SUPPORT OF JOINT
14	Plaintiffs,	EX PARTE MOTION TO CORRECT SCRIVENER'S ERROR IN
15	V.	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLARIFY NOTICE
16		
17	SIMILASAN CORPORATION	
18	Defendant.	
19 20		•
	I, Ronald A. Marron, hereby declare:	
21	1. I am counsel of record for Plaintiffs and the Class in this action. I am a	
22	member in good standing of the State Bar of California, the United States District Court for the Northern, Central, Eastern and Southern Districts, and the Ninth Circuit Court	
23	of Appeal.	
24		n support of the parties' Joint Ex Parte Motion
2526	to Correct Scrivener's Error in Settlement Agreement and Clarify Notice. I make this	
27	Declaration based on my personal knowledge and, if called to testify, I could and would	
28	competently testify to the matters contained herein.	

Allen et al. v. Similasan Corp. et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-376-BAS(JLB) DECLARATION OF RONALD A. MARRON IN SUPPORT OF JOINT EX PARTE MOTION

- 3. The parties in this action intended for the Settlement Agreement to have a thirty-day window between the opt out/objection deadline and the Final Approval Hearing. When the Settlement Agreement was prepared, a deadline of twenty-one days was mistakenly left in one part of the Agreement (paragraph 9.5.5), but the correct thirty-day window was included in other parts of the Agreement (paragraphs 9.5.1 9.5.3). This was purely a scrivener's error and does not reflect the intent of the parties. Consistent with paragraphs 9.5.1 through 9.5.3, the briefing on the issue, and the resulting Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. 204), there should be a thirty-day window so that Class Counsel can review any objections and brief any issues raised by the objections, with sufficient time for the Court to review both. The scrivener's error in 9.5.5 is not substantive and should be corrected to be consistent with other provisions on the same subject, namely, that a thirty-day window be provided.
- 4. In my opinion, the parties' modified notice plan, which will include Spanish language translation and Telephone Support, complies with due process.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 18th day of May 2016 in San Diego, California.

/s/ Ronald A. Marron RONALD A. MARRON ron@consumersadvocates.com

Class Counsel